

REMARKS

By the present amendment, claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the subject matter of claims 2-3 and to recite that the element includes an in-register authentication pattern comprising at least one of (i) a combination and (ii) a superposition of a front side pattern on its front side and of a reverse side pattern on its reverse side.

Support for the added recitation is found in the original application, for example, at least on page 2, lines 27-29.

Accordingly, claims 2-3 have been canceled.

Claims 1 and 4-24 are pending in the present application. Claim 1 is the only independent claim.

I. **Rejection based on Dames reference**

In the Office Action, claims 1-3, 6-8, 10-12, 14, 16, and 18-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by US 5,697,649 to Dames et al. ("Dames").

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Dames discloses a security thread with a magnetic material forming indicia on only one side (see Figures).

In contrast, in the presently claimed invention, the authentication pattern includes a front side pattern and a reverse side pattern, and in addition, that the element includes an in-register authentication pattern comprising at least one of (i) a combination and (ii) a superposition of a front side pattern on its front side and of a reverse side pattern on its reverse side, as recited in present

claim 1. Dames fails to provide any motivation or incentive to arrive at this feature. Therefore, the present claims are not anticipated by, and not obvious over, Dames.

In view of the above, it is submitted that the rejection should be withdrawn.

II. Rejections based on Melling

In the Office Action, claims 1, 4, and 13-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by US 4,493,093 to Melling et al. ("Melling").

Also, claims 5 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Melling in view of US 4,897,300 to Boehm ("Boehm").

Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Melling in view of Kaule.

Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Melling of allegedly admitted prior art (AAPA).

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the subject matter of claim 2, which is not included in these rejections. Accordingly, it is submitted that the rejections should be withdrawn.

III. Rejection based on Kaule

In the Office Action, claims 1 and 23-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by US 4,892,336 to Kaule et al. ("Kaule").

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the subject matter of claim 2, which is not included in this rejection. Accordingly, it is submitted that the rejection should be withdrawn.

Conclusion

In conclusion, the invention as presently claimed is patentable. It is believed that the claims are in allowable condition and a notice to that effect is earnestly requested.

If there is, in the Examiner's opinion, any outstanding issue and such issue may be resolved by means of a telephone interview, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

If this paper is not considered to be timely filed, the Applicants hereby petition for an appropriate extension of the response period. Please charge the fee for such extension and any other fees which may be required to Deposit Account No. 50-2866.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP

/nicolas seckel/

Nicolas E. Seckel
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 44,373
Telephone: (202) 822-1100
Facsimile: (202) 822-1111

NES/rep